THE HALE MEMORIAL SERMON, 1917

The Work of the Church

on behalf of

Unity

BY

THE RT. REV. C. P. ANDERSON, D.D.

BISHOP OF CHICAGO

Published for the

Western Theological Seminary

CHICAGO

By THE YOUNG CHURCHMAN CO.

MILWAUKEE, WISCONSIN, U. S. A.

The Hale Memorial Sermon No. 10

The Work of the Church

on behalf of

Unity

BY

The Rt. Rev. C. P. Anderson, D.D.

Bishop of Chicago

Preached at S. Paul's Church, Chicago,
on the Sunday next before
Advent, 1917.

Published for the
WESTERN THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
CHICAGO

By THE YOUNG CHURCHMAN CO.
Milwaukee, Wisconsin, U. S. A.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2016

https://archive.org/details/workofchurchonbe00ande_0

TO THE
GLORY OF GOD
AND IN MEMORY OF
ANNA McK. T. HALE
A LOVER OF EVERY GOOD WORD AND WORK
THE PREACHING AND PRINTING OF
THIS SERMON
WERE PROVIDED FOR BY
HER HUSBAND
C. R. H.

EXTRACTS

FROM THE WILL OF THE RT. REV. CHARLES REUBEN HALE, D. D., LL. D., BISHOP COADJUTOR OF SPRINGFIELD, *born* 1857 ; *consecrated July* 26, 1892 ; *died December* 25, 1900.

✝ In the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen.

I, Charles Reuben Hale, Bishop of Cairo, Bishop Coadjutor of Springfield, of the City of Cairo, Illinois, do make, publish, and declare this, as and for my Last Will and Testament, hereby revoking all former wills by me made.

First. First of all, I commit myself, soul and body, into the hands of Jesus Christ, my Lord and Saviour, in Whose Merits alone I trust, looking for the Resurrection of the Body and the Life of the World to come.

. . . . . .

Fourteenth. All the rest and residue of my Estate, personal and real, not in this my Will otherwise specifically devised, wheresoever situate, and whether legal or equitable, I give, devise, and bequeath to "The Western Theological Seminary, Chicago, Illinois," above mentioned, but nevertheless *In Trust*, provided it shall accept the trust by an instrument in writing so stating, filed with this Will in the Court where probated, within six months after the probate of this Will—for the general purpose of promoting the Catholic Faith, in its purity and integrity, as taught in Holy Scripture, held by the Primitive Church, summed up in the Creeds and affirmed by the undisputed General Councils, and, in particular, to be used only and exclusively for the purposes following, to wit:—

(1) The establishment, endowment, printing, and due circulation of a yearly *Sermon*, to be delivered annually forever, in memory of my dear wife, Anna McK. T. Hale, to be known as "The Hale Memorial Sermon," and

(2) The establishment, endowment, publication and due circulation of Courses of Lectures, to be delivered annually forever, to be called "The Hale Lectures."

. . . . . .

The subject of this Sermon shall be some branch of Church Work, in any part of the world, which, in the judgment of the Trustees of "The Western Theological Seminary, Chicago, Illinois," deserves to be better

known, in order that it may be more adequately appreciated. These sermons shall be preached at such time and place as the said Trustees of The Western Theological Seminary, Chicago, Illinois, may appoint, and shall be printed in a style similar to the Sermons of this kind already published under my direction, viz: "Confucianism in its relation to Christianity," and "The Religion of the Dakotas." One hundred copies of each of these Sermons are to be given, so soon as they come from the press, to the preacher thereof, and one copy of such Sermon is, so soon thereafter as may be, to be sent to each Bishop in the Anglican Communion, and to such other Bishops as may be in full communion with these Bishops, to the Patriarchs and other chief Hierarchs of the Orthodox Eastern Churches, and to the chief Public Libraries throughout the world. Should it be, at any time, deemed expedient to offer any of these Sermons for sale, the entire receipts, over and above the expenses incurred in such sale, shall be given to "The Domestic and Foreign Missionary Society of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America," a Corporation existing under the laws of the State of New York, for the uses of said Society.

. . . . . .

The preacher of the Hale Memorial Sermon shall always be a clergyman of the American Church, commonly called "The Protestant Episcopal Church," or of some Church in communion with the same, or of one of the Orthodox Eastern Churches.

. . . . . .

The Western Theological Seminary has accepted the Trusteeship as outlined in the above extracts from the will of the late Bishop Hale.

It will be the aim of the Seminary, through the Hale Sermons, to make from time to time some valuable contributions to certain of the Church problems of the day, without thereby committing itself to the utterances of its own selected Preachers.

NOTE

The portions of this sermon which come most precisely under the Hale foundation will be found on page 13 with the references in the footnotes. C. P. A.

The Work of the Church on Behalf of Unity

CHURCH UNITY
A VENTURE OF FAITH

"Whosoever will save his life shall lose it; and whosoever will lose his life for My sake shall find it."—S. Matt. xvi. 25.

"Salvation through self-abnegation" is one of the daring paradoxes of Christianity which has been abundantly verified in the lives of the makers of progress.

The principle is as true of the Church and Nation as it is of the individual. It is a principle which should govern the American Church and the American Nation in these days. Both should venture their very life, their structure, their resources, and their possessions for the ideals which they respectively represent. Both should find their highest welfare, not in a close calculation of material advantage, but in a reckless devotion to spiritual principles. If they love their lives they will lose their souls; if they venture their lives for God's sake they will save their souls.

It is a critical time in the world's history. It is a testing time in the life of the Church. These are days which measure the capacity of the Christian Church for faith, for service, for sacrifice, and for prophetic vision. The world will never again be what it was prior to August 1914.

It will never be the same politically. The irresistible power of democracy which has been slowly arriving through the centuries will either be temporarily set back in its progress or it will acquire a wider application and a richer meaning. The science of diplomacy will either see a triumph of deceit and intrigue or else it will be transformed into an honest and open-minded skill in international conciliation.

The world will never be the same again industrially or socially. The relationship between Capital and Labour, between master and man (to use an expression that has already become taboo) will be permanently altered. The coming day will witness either the firmer establishment of a "benevolent feudalism"[1] which hands down benefits to the people, or else it will witness the supremacy of the people and the assertion of their capacity for partnership in the management of the world's industrial affairs.[2] A world made "safe for democracy"—to quote President Wilson—will be impatient with paternalism.

The world will never be the same again religiously. The nations are being drawn together into an international fellowship of democracies; and the future of the Christian Church, humanly speaking,

---

[1] Ghent's "Our Benevolent Feudalism," p. 60. Professor Ely calls it "enlightened absolutism."

[2] See Ghent's "Our Benevolent Feudalism," pp. 123, 151 for denials of the rights of labour and compare them with events in industry in England, America, and elsewhere since the war began.

will depend largely on whether the churches will allow themselves to be drawn together into a catholic fellowship of the people of God.

These are the issues which the pregnant pains of this travailing world announce—the new political democracy, the new social and industrial commonwealth, the new coalition of the Christian forces of the world, that a Christian civilization may expand and endure.

A common danger, a life-and-death struggle, is welding many of the nations into a compact alliance. Their sole hope for the triumph of democracy rests on their ability to combine their forces in a single definite programme. What about the churches? Will they lead the world into the consciousness of universal brotherhood; or failing in that, will they follow the world's lead?

The Christian Church is facing the greatest crisis in her history. That crisis was on before the war came. The war revealed the crisis. It revealed the fact that civilization cannot be built on the shifting sands of materialism. It also convicted the Church of incompetence as a world force. It proclaimed its failure in the social and political sphere. The crisis is still on. The main question is this: Shall a Christian civilization founded on the fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man, as taught by Jesus Christ, dominate the world? The forces against us are mighty. The outlook is dark. The hope of the churches is to be found precisely where the hope of the nations is to be

found, in coming together into a single compact Army of God.

The issues of to-day are not the local controversies between religious sects and political parties. They are world issues. Sectarianism can no more meet them than a detached group of Belgiums and Serbias and Armenias could withstand the organized might of Prussian militarism. Even within the sphere of a special service in these war-times, all the churches, working separately, could not make an aggregate contribution to the well-being of our soldiers, sailors, and aviators, that would approach the magnitude of the work done by that international organization, the Young Men's Christian Association.[3] To be efficient in a single large undertaking they must combine. Truly indeed could Dr. Mott say, with this object lesson before him, "The greatest need of our generation is that of apostles of reconciliation." The Y. M. C. A., though not operated formally by the churches, is sanctioned and supported by them and floats the banner of Christ over all its works in all lands. But what of those other moral forces and Christian enterprises which a divided Christendom has completely divorced from the Christianity

[3] I am not unmindful of the excellent work done by the Knights of Columbus. Such a work could only be done by such a strong organization as the Roman Catholic Church. Both in its extent and in its limitations it illustrates my point.

which gave them their impetus and inspiration?[4] Sectarianism is necessarily incapable of thinking nationally or acting internationally or moulding the world conscience. "A united Christendom alone can rise to the unique opportunities which the heathen world now presents and meet the crying social evils of our Western civilization. Reunion is indeed the most imperative need of the time, and any man or any body of men who are guilty of obstructing that consummation by selfish considerations alone, incur a serious responsibility."[5] In unity there is victory. In disunity there is defeat.

What are the prospects of Unity? They are not very bright, except within the realm of a very prolific literature. Take the Anglican Communion. It has been conspicuous in its advocacy of Church Unity. From the time that it detached the Pope[6] from its domestic councils and protested that in doing so it did not detach itself from the unity of Catholic Christendom[7]—from that time down to the

---

[4] See my "Manifestation of Unity," pp. 23-30, published by the Joint Commission on the World Conference; Robert H. Gardiner, Secretary, Gardiner, Maine.

[5] "The People of God," Hamilton, Vol. II, p. iv.

[6] Convocation declared in 1534 that "The Bishop of Rome hath not by Scripture any greater authority in England than any other foreign Bishop." *Vide* Wakeman's "History of the Church of England," p. 222. This denial of a divine prerogative left untouched any question of acquired primacy or authority.

[7] In 1533, Statute 25 Henry VIII, C. 21, stated "That the King and Parliament did not intend by it (repudiation of Papal supremacy)

present it has been to the front in keeping the matter of unity alive. By Canon[8] and Statute[9] it reiterated its corporate membership in the Catholic Church. Through informal correspondence[10] and

---

to decline or vary from the congregation of Christ's Church in anything concerning the very articles of the Catholic Faith of Christendom." See Green's "XXXIX Articles," p. 5.

"The Canon of 1571 concerning Preachers enjoined the clergy never to preach anything to be religiously held and believed by the people except what is agreeable to the doctrine of the Old or New Testaments, or which the Catholic Fathers and ancient Bishops have collected from that doctrine." *Vide* MacColl's "Reformation Settlement," p. 35.

[8] The English Canon XXX says: "Nay, so far was it from the purpose of the Church of England to forsake and reject the Churches of Italy, France, Spain, and Germany, or any such like churches in all things which they held and practised, that, as the apology of the Church of England confesseth, it doth with reverence retain these ceremonies which do neither endamage the Church of God, nor offend the minds of sober men; and only departed from them in those particular points, wherein they were fallen both from themselves in their ancient integrity and from the Apostolical Churches, which were their first founders."

[9] Statute I Elizabeth, Cap. I, XXXVI, A. D. 1558, declared that "nothing is to be adjudged heresy but that which heretofore has been adjudged by the authority of the Canonical Scriptures, or the first four General Councils, or some other General Council, wherein the same hath been declared heresy by the express word of Scripture," etc. *Vide* MacColl's "Reformation Settlement," pp. 35, 36.

[10] Archbishop Wake corresponded with Gallican theologians in 1716 when they were feeling the stress of controversy with ultramontanism. The Gallicans desired that the English should "return into the bosom of the Catholic Church on the same footing as the Gallican Church." Archbishop Wake refused. Courayer's "Validity of the Ordinations of the English" grew out of this correspondence. "Courayer contends for their validity in the strongest possible terms." See J. H. Overton and F. Relton—"A History of the English Church from the Accession of George I," etc., pp. 21-29.

The English Non-jurors had a correspondence with the Eastern Orthodox bishops, 1716-1725. See Lathbury, "History of the Non-jurors," Ch. VIII, London 1845, for a full account of this correspondence.

Lord Halifax, the Rev. T. A. Lacey, and other English Churchmen had prolonged irenic conferences with the Abbé Portal, the Abbé

formal resolutions[11] it initiated irenic conferences with both Catholics and Protestants. In England[12] and America,[13] in Rome[14] and Russia,[15] in Africa[16]

Duchesne, and other Roman Catholics, which resulted in the bull *Apostolicae Curae* against Anglican Orders, to which the English bishops replied in February, 1897. See "A Roman Diary," etc., T. A. Lacey, p. 354; also "Leo XIII and Anglican Orders," by Lord Halifax; also "Reunion Essays," by Carson, p. 251. For the reply of the English bishops see "Answers of the Archbishops of England to the Apostolic Letter of Pope Leo XIII on English ordinations," Longmans, Green and Co.

In December 1899 a Conference on the Eucharist took place at Oxford between Anglican and Non-conformist divines. See "Priesthood and Sacrifice," edited by A. W. Sanday.

[11] See "The Lambeth Conference of 1897," compiled by Archbishop Davidson, for the resolutions of the Conference in regard to the Eastern Church, the Old Catholics, the *Unitas Fratrum*, the Church of Sweden, the Latin Communion, and the Protestant Churches. See also "Conference of Bishops of the Anglican Communion," 1908, pp. 61-66 and 169-186, for further resolutions.

[12] The Savoy Conference of 1661 was attended by twelve bishops and twelve Puritan ministers. The Hampton Court Conference of 1604 was a meeting of Churchmen to which four prominent Puritan clergy were invited. Both of these conferences, however, were far from irenic. See Wakeman's "History of the Church of England," pp. 351-354, 382-384.

In recent years gatherings of "Anglican and Free Church Clergy" for conference on Unity have been quite frequent. See "Introduction to the Study of Christian Reunion," A. C. Bouquet, pp. 169-177.

In 1857 the Association for promoting the Unity of Christendom was formed. The Annual Report of 1900 stated that this Society had "many thousands" of members, Anglicans, Greeks, Latins, Lutherans, and others.

The Home Reunion Society conducted a conference between Anglican and Congregationalist divines. See "England and the Holy See," Spencer Jones, pp. 427-430.

[13] Dr. Muhlenburg made a notable effort towards Unity in the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in 1853. See "Memorial Papers, with Introduction by Alonzo Potter." Philadelphia, 1857.

In 1880 the bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church put forth the following declaration:

"The bishops of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America in council assembled, as bishops in the Church of

God, do hereby solemnly declare to all whom it may concern, and especially to our fellow-Christians of the different communions in this land, who, in their several spheres, have contended for the religion of Christ:

"(1) Our earnest desire that the Saviour's prayer 'that we all may be one' may, in its deepest and truest sense, be speedily fulfilled.

"(2) That we believe that all who have been duly baptized with water in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost are members of the Holy Catholic Church.

"(3) That in all things of human ordering or human choice, relating to modes of worship and discipline or to traditional customs, this Church is ready, in the spirit of love and humility, to forego all preferences of her own.

"(4) That this Church does not seek to absorb other communions, but rather, coöperating with them on a basis of a common faith and order, to discountenance schism, to heal the wounds of the body of Christ, and to promote the charity which is the chief of Christian graces and the visible manifestation of Christ to the world.

"*But Furthermore*, we do affirm that the Christian unity now so earnestly desired by the memorialists can be restored only by the return of all Christian communions to the principles of unity exemplified by the undivided Catholic Church during the first ages of its existence; which principles we believe to be the substantial deposit of Christian faith and order committed by Christ and His apostles to the Church unto the end of the world, and therefore incapable of compromise or surrender by those who have been ordained to be its stewards and trustees for the common and equal benefit of all men.

"As inherent parts of this sacred deposit, and therefore as essential to the restoration of unity among the divided branches of Christendom, we account the following, to-wit:

"(1) The Holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments as the revealed Word of God:

"(2) The Nicene Creed as the sufficient statement of the Christian faith:

"(3) The two sacraments, Baptism and the Supper of the Lord, ministered with unfailing use of Christ's words of institution, and of the elements ordained by Him:

"(4) The Historic Episcopate, locally adapted in the methods of its administration to the varying needs of the nations and peoples called of God into the unity of His Church.

"*Furthermore*, deeply grieved by the sad divisions which afflict the Christian Church in our own land, we hereby declare our desire and readiness, so soon as there shall be any authorized response to this declaration, to enter into brotherly conference with all or any Christian bodies seeking the restoration of the organic unity of the Church, with a view to the earnest study of the conditions under which so priceless a blessing might happily be brought to pass."

and Australia,[17] in Sweden[18] and Germany,[19] it has

For a reply on the part of the Disciples of Christ, see "A History of the Disciples of Christ," by B. B. Tyler, pp. 82-94.

For an account of the negotiations between the Presbyterians and the American Bishops, see "Church Unity: the Progress and Suspension of the Negotiations between the Protestant Episcopal Church and the Presbyterian Churches," Presbyterian Board of Publication, 1899.

[14] See Note 10 on page 14.

[15] For correspondence between the Archbishop of Canterbury and the Metropolitans of the Russian Church see "Russia and Reunion", by Biggs, pp. 237-259.

In 1908 the Lambeth Conference requested the Archbishop of Canterbury to send a deputation to the National Council of the Russian Church, and also requested the Archbishop to appoint a permanent committee to take cognizance of all that concerns relations with the Churches of the Orthodox East. See "Conference of Bishops of the Anglican Communion," p. 61.

In 1914 the Rev. W. H. Frere delivered a course of lectures in Russia under the auspices of the Russian Society for promoting Rapprochement between the Anglican and Eastern Orthodox Churches. See "English Church Ways," by Frere, The Young Churchman Co., Milwaukee. A series of lectures under similar circumstances was delivered by Fr. Puller in St. Petersburg in 1912, and published under the title, "The Continuity of the English Church." Arrangements are being made for some lectures in England on the Russian Church by distinguished Russian Churchmen, under the auspices of "The Anglican and Eastern-Orthodox Churches Union." In 1909, under the auspices of this last-named Society, a conference was held between the Nippon Sei Ko Kwai and the Haristos Sei Kyo Kwai (the Anglican and Russian Churches in Japan). Archbishop Nicolai attended the Conference. "An Attempt at Unity in Japan," by Rev. Charles F. Sweet.

[16] At a Missionary Conference in Kikuyu the Bishops of Uganda and Mombasa drew up a scheme of federation with the Protestant missionary communities, and at the conclusion of the conference the Bishop of Mombasa administered the Communion to the delegates from those bodies. The Bishop of Zanzibar formally protested against the action taken by his brethren.

[17] Conferences between Committees appointed by the Synod of the Church of England in Australia and the General Assembly of the Presbyterian Church of Australia were held in Melbourne in 1906 and 1907. Tentative resolutions were adopted looking towards a formal union of the two churches.

[18] A conference between a Commission appointed by the Archbishop of Canterbury and representatives of the Church of Sweden was held

pressed the matter on the churches. In the Chicago-Lambeth "Quadrilateral" it proposed a basis of inter-church negotiations,[20] and in the proposed World Conference on Faith and Order[21] it inaugurated a movement that has unity as its ultimate object. Having said this it seems necessary to go on and say that the Anglican Communion has been

---

under the presidency of the Archbishop of Upsala in September 1909. See "The Church of England and the Church of Sweden," The Young Churchman Co., Milwaukee.

For the relation between the Church of Sweden and the Episcopal Church in America, see "The National Church of Sweden," Hale Lectures by Bishop Wordsworth (under the auspices of the Western Theological Seminary, Chicago), pp. 399-414.

[19] Representatives of the Anglican Church participated in a Conference held at Bonn, with Old Catholics, Orientals, and others, under the invitation of Dr. Döllinger. "Report of Proceedings at the Reunion Conference held at Bonn, 1874," Rivingtons.

Several Anglicans were in attendance at the international Conference of Old Catholics in Cologne in 1913.

[20] The Lambeth Conference of 1897 reaffirmed its resolution of 1888, which was substantially, though not exactly, the declaration of the American Bishops in 1886. The "Quadrilateral" was put forth, not so much as a basis of unity, but as "a basis on which *approach* may be, by God's blessing, made towards Home Reunion." See "The Lambeth Conference of 1897," p. 80.

[21] At the General Convention of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America in 1910, the following resolution was adopted:

> "WHEREAS, There is to-day among all Christian people a growing desire for the fulfilment of our Lord's prayer that all His disciples may be one; that the world may believe that God has sent Him:
>
> "*Resolved*, That a Joint Commission be appointed to bring about a Conference for the consideration of questions touching Faith and Order, and that all Christian Communions throughout the world which confess our Lord JESUS CHRIST as God and Saviour be asked to unite with us in arranging for and conducting such a Conference. . . ."

Robert H. Gardiner, Gardiner, Maine, is the Secretary of that Commission and will be glad to furnish literature covering the work of the Commission.

as conspicuously timid in its practice as it has been conspicuously bold in its theory. It is afraid of its own ideals. It shrinks from the logical consequences of its own corporate actions. It is academic. Must it not plead guilty to this charge?

What about others? They are probably no better and no worse. Take the Roman Catholic Church. Under the spiritual leadership of the great Leo XIII there were grounds for hope that a bridge might be built over the chasm that separates the Roman Catholic Church from the rest of Christendom.[22] Mutual approach loomed up as a possibility. Unhappily, however, a reactionary policy subsequently prevailed, under which it was impossible for the non-Roman world to pursue the subject except on a basis of intellectual suicide.[23]

Passing from the venerable Church of Rome to one of the youngest churches, take the case of the Disciples of Christ in America.[24] That organiza-

---

[22] See Encyclical Letters, 1894, on the Reunion of Christendom; 1895, to the English people; 1896, on the Unity of the Church, in "The Great Encyclical Letters of Leo XIII," Benzinger Brothers. For a reply to the encyclical, *Apostolicae Curae*, see "Answer of the Archbishops of England to the Apostolic Letter of Pope Leo XIII on English Ordinations," 1897, Longmans, Green & Co.

[23] "The Pope's good intentions," wrote Gladstone, "have broken down and the true spirit of the Curia has triumphed over them."

Dr. Briggs, in his "Theological Symbolics," p. 234, states that the encyclical of Pius X against Modernism led up to "a system of suspicion, inquisition, and delation which has brought the administration of justice in the Church into contempt and has forced a large proportion of Catholic scholars to silence and retraction, or suspension, excommunication, and withdrawal from the Church."

[24] Organized May 4, 1810, "in order to carry out for themselves the duties and obligations enjoined on them in the Scriptures." "A

tion started out with a single lofty purpose. It would show the way to unity both in theory and practice. How far has it succeeded? It has made some excellent contributions to the literature on Unity.[25] It has held up high ideals before the Christian public. But has it not also succeeded in adding to the confusion by creating first one and then two[26] additional organizations with their distinct lines of differentiation and demarcation? So with all from first to last. All are academic and none seems ready to make the self-forgetful venture of faith.

But things cannot go on as they are. All is not well in Zion. All is not well with the world. One trembles to think how much of the guilt of this world convulsion may rightly be charged up against a divided and inefficient Church. Let that pass, however. The immediate fact is that nothing less than a world revolution is taking place. Movements as significant as the Mediaeval Renaissance, the Protestant Reformation, and the French Revolution are going on before our eyes. Just as serfdom gave way to feudalism, and feudalism yielded somewhat to altruism, so the present order is giving

---

History of the Disciples of Christ," B. B. Tyler. The Christian Literature Co.

[25] *The Christian Union Quarterly*, edited by Peter Ainslie, Seminary House, Baltimore, Md., is an excellent publication devoted to Unity.

[26] The "Churches of Christ" appears to be an offshoot from the "Disciples." Census of Religious Bodies, 1906, Part I, p. 15: Government Printing Office, Washington, D. C.

way to some form of collectivism. Greek civilization had its day of glory and gave way to Rome. Rome fell and gave way to the Christian civilization of mediaeval Europe. This civilization, through reformation and revolution and reaction, and through an over emphasis on the doctrine of individual rights, gave way to what is proudly called Modern Civilization. Its gods are individualism, intellectualism, and materialism. It cannot survive. It is breaking down as "a world in arms hammers out its unknown future on bloody anvils."[27]

Can the churches remain unmoved, like S. Simeon Stylites on his pillar, as a staggering civilization passes on? Can the churches remain static while the whole fabric of society is undergoing structural changes? Can a fossilized traditionalism supply the spiritual dynamic to the new age? "Jesus Christ is the same yesterday and to-day and forever."[28] That means that He is eternally young, the Redeemer of the twentieth century. Dare the churches go on preaching a disintegrated Christ to this newborn era which is hailing internationalism and the progressive solidarity of brotherhood as its new Saviours? Must not the churches expect to undergo something as revolutionary as what is going on around them?

There will be a difference, of course, for the

---

[27] Cram's "The Substance of Gothic," p. 2.

[28] Heb. XIII, 8.

Kingdom of Christ "is not of this world."[29] The revolution in the Churches will be a recovery and not a discovery. They will discover no new faith, but the recovery of the lost charter of the Church's unity is surely the revolutionary challenge of the hour. Only through a resurgent faith in the power of Christianity to reassert its corporate strength can we look beyond the social revolution of to-day to the spiritual regeneration of to-morrow. Revolutions are frequently a compound of two ingredients, evolution and recovery. They return to the past to take a fresh grip on eternal verities, from which base alone can the human soul confidently leap forward into the future. The Renaissance and the Reformation were recoveries as well as evolutions. They returned to the past to find hope for the future. The Renaissance revolted against scholasticism and returned to the intellectual atmosphere of Greece for the development of the intellect. The Reformation revolted against ecclesiasticism and returned to the conscience of primitive Christianity for the development of the soul.[30] So the new revolution in the churches may be confidently welcomed as an evolution and a recovery. It will be a recovery of a lost conscience on the unity of the Body of Christ. It will be an evolution from chaos to cosmos.

There was a time when the Church was visibly

---

[29] S. John XVIII, 36.

[30] Gunsaulus' "Martin Luther and the Morning Hour in Europe," pp. 3-6. University of Chicago Press.

one; when the churches of Jerusalem and Rome and Corinth and Ephesus and Phillipi and Colosse were one; when the churches of Europe and Asia, with their varied and multitudinous membership, were one. That was the most productive period of the Church's life. That early Church was constructive, dynamic, evolutionary, and revolutionary.[31] It did not try to save its own life. It made daring ventures for God. It was not self-conscious. It was self-forgetful. It had a sublime consciousness of a mission from God. It had an overwhelming conviction that God so loved the world that He sent His only-begotten Son that the world through Him might be saved; that God was in Christ reconciling the world unto Himself; that the Church was the Body of Christ, the executive agency for bringing in the Kingdom of righteousness and peace and joy; that Christ crucified was to be preached as the power and wisdom of God, even though it were a stumbling block to some and foolishness to others. This was the Church's message. She could proclaim no other. She proclaimed it, not for her own sake, but for Christ's sake and the world's sake. What matter what happened, if she fulfilled her Mission? What mattered it if there were political persecution and social ostracism, and perils by land and sea, and imprisonments and martyrdoms — what mattered all

[31] "Early Christianity is not static and miraculous, but dynamic and evolutional."—Professor Percy Gardner in October *Hibbert Journal*, p. 122.

these things if the Kingdom of God were being set up?

The Church was concerned with only one thing. That one thing was not her own life. She risked it every day in preaching her Gospel. As the Gospel was proclaimed the world began to be changed and turned "upside down."[32] The corner stones of our highest civilizations began to be laid. Liberty, fraternity, and equality began to be born. Beneficent ideals began to find their way into the statute-books of the nations. Guilds and crafts and brotherhoods and sisterhoods for mutual help and protection began to spring into being. A new kind of art and architecture was born. Woman began to occupy her proper place in the world. Slavery began to be abolished. War itself started out on its long, long journey towards extinction. Men acquired a new conscience in regard to the sinfulness of sin and the dignity of service. They arrived at new ideals about home and wife and child and mother, and the most hopeless of men found a new power to lift them from the mire and stand them up among the princes of God's people. These things did not happen in a day. They have not all fully happened yet. The Kingdom of God is in process of becoming. But all that we mean by a Christian civilization made continental strides forward, as a self-forgetful Church staked its very life on God in a hostile world.

---

[32] Acts XVII, 6.

Come down several centuries. The Church had then acquired great power, political and social, but with it she became self-conscious; conscious of the greatness of the institution itself, conscious of her power and pomp and glory. With the dawn of self-consciousness she lost that self-forgetfulness which had been the secret of her earlier strength. Then followed spiritual decay. Then followed revolt and schism as a righteous protest against the loss of spiritual vision. Then followed in turn the substitution of many churches for the one Church of the New Testament and folios of theology for the simple symbols of primitive Christianity. Then followed later the same self-consciousness on the part of the separate churches as they, themselves, had protested against on the day of their birth. Is not that the situation to-day? The churches are self-conscious. They have a meticulous dread that something may happen to the outward fabric, to the traditions, to the sect structure of the organization. What does it matter what becomes of the churches, if the Church remains as God's vice-gerent, the witness for Christ and the conscience of the nations? They were the spiritually dull ages of the Church that invented such a title as "defender of the Faith," and conferred it on such a licentious Christian as King Henry VIII. The Faith has never needed such defenders. It needs propagators. It carries the evidence of its truth along with it. The Church needs no protectors to-day. It needs liberators.

The churches need to be liberated from sectarianism, from conventionalism, from the tyranny of inherited pride, prejudice, and ignorance, and from bondage to mere idiosyncracies. They need to lose their sect-consciousness and to recover the Kingdom-of-God-consciousness of an earlier day. They need to go back to the rock from whence they were hewn, in order that they may go forward to new conquests of the waste places.[33]

What is Church unity? In many minds it appears to be synonymous with undenominationalism. That would be an unspeakable calamity. The elimination of differences would leave nothing behind but an irreducible minimum which is infinitely less than the gospel of Jesus Christ. Nor is Church unity the same thing as interdenominationalism or federationism, although these may squint in the right direction. Church unity cannot be manufactured. A new Body of Christ cannot be constructed by any human ingenuity. As Father Kelly says in his "Church and Religious Unity," "a living unity cannot be constructed, but it already exists in the Christianity we are trying to apprehend." Even the coming together of the churches would not constitute a brand-new Church of Christ. On the other hand the churches cannot realize or apprehend or show forth the power or the unity of the Body while they are in a state of organized schism. Unity is that condition of life

[33] Isaiah 51: 1-3.

under which the Body functions normally as a single living organism. It is that condition under which the churches lose themselves in the Church. It is that condition under which all the parts work in harmony with and under the direction of the whole. It is that condition under which Christians of every race can make their communion at the one altar of Christ, under circumstances, however variable, which have the sanction of the whole Church.

There are two ways of approaching the realization of unity—the way of mutual concession and the way of mutual contribution. Those bodies which are nearest akin might consolidate through mutual surrender of their differences. A similar process might then be repeated with the resultant bodies. And so on. Such initial steps would appear to be entirely practicable and would be a consummation devoutly to be wished. Ultimately they might lead to the final goal. This method of approach, however, is open to criticism. It is the way of compromise rather than comprehension. It demands concessions in an enterprise that calls for contributions. Each concession may mean the forfeiture of some spiritual value. Concessions in one direction would probably have to be followed by concessions in another. Honest convictions touching fundamental orthodoxy might soon become involved. And at the end of a series of cautious concessions a union might be reached at the expense of life and truth. In this case the resultant church

would not be worth dying for nor be able to produce saints and martyrs.

The other way of approaching the subject is the way of faith. Faith in God, loyalty to Christ, obedience to His will, a readiness to lose our churches for His sake—is not this Christ's way? It is along no highway of man's building that the answer to Christ's prayer will come. It is through no mechanical process. It is by no ecclesiastical bargaining. It will come through a venture of faith in Christ and through trust in the brethren. When Christ instituted the great sacrament of unity He required no preliminary agreement reaching out into the sphere of philosophy and metaphysics. "Take, eat," He said, "This is My Body. Do this." It was an act of faith that was required, not a full understanding; an act in which the learned and the unlearned could participate with equal affection and adoration. So with the unity of the Body: It cannot be materialized through an intellectual agreement covering a wide range of thought, but it can be realized through an act of faith in a Person and through the oblation of the will. It was religious decay whereby Christ was wounded in the house of His friends; and only the restoration of a sacrificial devotion to the Person of Christ can heal the wounds. Christlikeness, within the household of faith, if raised to a sufficiently high level, will, in itself and by itself, restore the wholeness of the Church. Christlikeness, and that alone, will envelop within the unity those principles of

order and liberty that are essential to the solidarity of the Christian Society. Is not this the meaning of Christ's prayer, that the visible oneness of His people will convert the world, by convincing it that such inseparability is the evidential embodiment of a common Christlikeness at its base?[34]

These are the two methods of approach—the way of caution and the way of venture. The one takes one trembling step at a time, the other stakes everything on God. The one has been repeatedly tried and has been uniformly abortive.[35] The other has never been tried. And, after all, is not the larger plan more practicable and more hopeful than the piecemeal plan? Many a man would gladly lose his life for a great cause who would reluctantly yield a mere privilege to some hazardous half-measure. The difficulties of reconciliation are often in inverse ratio to the proximity of the disputants. Family quarrels are notoriously hard to settle.

Some such considerations as these seem to lie at the base of the proposed World Conference on Faith and Order.[36] It aims to embrace all forms

---

[34] "We cannot oppose 'organic unity' and 'spiritual unity' when applied to the Church, as though they were mutually exclusive; for just in so far as the Church is permeated through and through with the presence of the Holy Spirit, will it be in a position to perfect its organization for the accomplishment of the work God has set it to perform and to realize its organic unity." Hamilton's "People of God," Vol. II, p. 184.

[35] I do not mean that they have not been productive of good results, but that they have not reached any definite form and shape.

[36] "We believe that the time has now arrived when *representatives of the whole family of Christ*, led by the Holy Spirit, may be willing

of organized Christianity whose central principle is allegiance to the incarnate Son of God. Rising above everything partial and sectional, it would assemble Catholics and Protestants into a conference, so truly representative that it would be ecumenical in its reach though without the embarrassment of power to bind its participating bodies. Relying on the guiding Spirit of God rather than on any skill in diplomacy, it would endeavor to "make straight in the desert a highway for our God." "On first thought the bigness of the plan seems to make it impractical, if not impossible. On second thought, however, it is its very bigness which seems to make it possible and practicable. Its wide scope lifts it above local difficulties. It lifts it above the spirit of the age into the spirit of the ages. There is scarcely a nation in the world to-day wherein a national conference for the same purpose could take place. Political complications, educational controversies, social inequalities between established and unestablished churches—these and conditions such as these make national conferences on Faith and Order quite impracticable. But a World Conference lifts the whole subject above those national and artificial barriers that men erect between themselves; it lifts it above the realm of racial types and local phases; it lifts it above the incidents and accidents

---

to come together for the consideration of questions of Faith and Order." From the preamble to the resolution calling for the appointment of the Commission.

and tragedies of history into the clearer vision of the universality of Christ and the unity of His Body, the Church. Multitudinous difficulties automatically disappear as saints and scholars of many lands and churches meet to contemplate a world Saviour, saving a whole world, through a world Church."[37]

Unity through a venture of faith: are the churches ready for it? It certainly will not come through argument. Are the churches prepared to accept the positive principles (not the negative, for people are generally right in their affirmations and wrong in their negations)—are they prepared to accept the positive principles of Catholicism and Protestantism, *in faith* that when housed under the same roof, contact and fellowship will remove the difficulties and disarm the hostilities that the separated parts have towards each other? That is the question. Have Romanism and Anglicanism and Protestantism and the Orthodox conservatism of the East, such faith in God and such confidence in the Christian brotherhood as to believe that the demonstrated spiritual values which each regards as its own special stewardship, are compatible and reconcilable in the one household of God?[38] Looking broadly over Christendom

---

[37] From my address before the North American Preparatory Conference, Garden City, January 1916.

[38] For an illuminating account of the agreements between Catholics and Protestants, see the chapters on Comparative Symbolics in Briggs' "Theological Symbolics," pp. 251-273. "The fundamental principles of the Reformation were common to the Protestant Reform and the Roman

there are outstanding elements of interior religion and of exterior structure which appear to have demonstrated their right to be regarded as permanent features of the Christian Church.

I. The positive principles of Protestantism (to reverse the historic order) are permanent. They are not ephemeral. They were not discovered by Protestantism. They were recovered. Protestantism has no monopoly of them. The Pope himself would probably put his imprimatur upon them.[30] Is it conversion? Is it a conscious discipleship to Christ? Is it a free accessibility

---

Catholic Reform. The consensus of the Symbols of the Reformation, even as regards the new doctrines, is much greater than the dissensus; and it is just in this consensus that the real symbolic advance of the Christian Church has been made."

[30] The anathemas of the Roman Catholic Church are directed against *the rejection of truth* on the part of Protestants, rather than against their positive teachings. "If any one denieth," "if any one saith that there is not," is the general form of the decrees of the Council of Trent on Baptism, Confirmation, Holy Orders, the Eucharist, etc. Even here explanation, interpretation, and mutual humility may remove hostility. Cardinal Wiseman approvingly quoted "the profound and pious Möhler" as follows: "After observing," he says, "that no Catholic can refuse to acknowledge with humiliation the corruptions of past ages, that this proof lies in the very existence of Protestantism which could not have existed without them; he thus concludes: 'Apprenez donc une fois, ô Protestants, la grandeur des abus que vous nous reprochez sur la grandeur de vos propres égarements. Voilà le terrain, sur lequel les deux églises se recontreront un jour, et se donneront la main. Dans le sentiment de nôtre faute commune, nous devons nous écrier, et les uns et les autres, 'Nous avons tous manqués, l'Eglise seule ne peut faillir; nous avons tous pêchés, l'Eglise seule est pure de toute souillure'."

The failures of such attempts at reconciliation as were made by DuPin and Wake, by Bossuet and Leibnitz, by Hugo Grotius and others, have been due, as the Roman Catholic Bishop Doyle said, "more to princes than priests; more to state policy than a difference of belief." See Pusey's "Eirenicon," 1866, pp. 25, 26, 245; also Ainslie's "The Message of the Disciples for the Union of the Church," pp. 66, 67.

to God in prayer? Is it a conscious spiritual experience? Is it the priesthood of believers?[40] Is it justification by faith?[41] Is it a belief in Holy Scripture?[42] They are the property of Christians everywhere. It is isolation that makes heresy. A truth may cease to be true when divorced from other truths and put forth as exclusive truth. Churches may be right in their attachment to their principles and at the same time wrong in their detachment from the fulness of truth as contained within the life of the whole body. The problem of unity, so far as it concerns Protestants, is not to prove that their fundamental doctrines are true. They are not seriously in dispute. The problem is that of organically relating the parts to the whole.

II. The Faith is permanent. "Earnestly

---

[40] The whole body of baptized Christians being "A spiritual house, a *holy priesthood*, to offer up spiritual sacrifices" (I S. Pet. II, 5) the official ministers cannot be less than priests. The "priesthood of the laity" does not mean the "laicising" of the priesthood.

[41] The controversy is over the word "*only*"; but "the difference is not so great as it appears to be." "If Faith is the *root* of justification, as the Roman Catholics teach, and all Christian graces spring from that root, how does that differ from the Protestant teaching, that good works are *the fruits of faith?*" See Briggs' "Theological Symbolics," pp. 310-316, for a comparison between Roman Catholic and Protestant Confessions.

[42] There was strange irony in Pope Leo's appeal to Protestants: "Whereas, formerly they used to assert that the books of the Old and New Testament were written under the inspiration of God, they now deny them that authority; this indeed was an inevitable consequence when they granted to all the right of private interpretation. . . . hence those conflicting opinions and numerous sects that fall away so often into the doctrines of Naturalism and Rationalism."—Encyclical *Praeclara Gratulationis Publicae*, June 20, 1894.

contend for the faith that was once delivered to the saints," exhorts S. Jude. The Faith, what is it? It is that light of truth and spiritual experience which radiates from the Sun of Righteousness and illuminates the pages of Holy Scripture and the lives of holy men. It is that body of truth which grows out from the central fact that "the Word was made flesh and dwelt among us." It is that body of truth, formulated from the Scriptures, which had the outward sanction of an undivided Church and the inward sanction of universal experience. *Quod semper, quod ubique, quod ab omnibus creditum est.* The Faith! It is the watchword of Russia and of millions of Christians in the East. By it they live. For it they die. It is not theirs alone. Occident and Orient can unite in singing—

> "Faith of our fathers, Holy Faith,
> We will be true to thee till death."

Again, the problem of unity is not that of discovering or rediscovering the Christian Faith. It is the problem of fighting together under the banner of the orthodox faith with all the orderliness of an army of God.

III. The sacramental system is permanent. A religion which revolves around the Incarnation cannot be other than a sacramental religion. The number of sacraments will depend upon one's definitions. If a sacrament is defined simply as

"a visible sign of an invisible grace" [43] the number will be large. If the definition is drawn more tightly, the number will be reduced.[44] But the truth or value of the thing itself is not dependent upon any definition. Sacraments have always been integral features of the Christian Church. There has been a consensus concerning the two great sacraments of Baptism and the Eucharist. The dissensus concerning other means of grace cannot rightly be erected into a barrier against a united Church.[45]

IV. Episcopacy is a permanent feature of the Church. Its importance lies not in the institution itself but in the underlying principle of continuity and order which it embodies. No attempt is here made to argue the question or to contrast it with the papacy or the "historic presbyterate" or to discuss its origin. This is only a bird's-eye view

---

[43] S. Augustine, The City of God, X, 5: "Sacrifices signified the things which we do for the purpose of drawing near to God. . . . A Sacrifice therefore is the visible sacrament or sacred sign of an invisible sacrifice."

[44] Only two Sacraments comply with the contents of the Anglican definition—"generally necessary to salvation." This does not imply that there are no other sacramental means of grace. Luther recognized three Sacraments, Richard Baxter, five.

[45] "The dispute as to the number of the sacraments is indeed 'a question of a name.' . . . S. Thomas Aquinas seems to doubt, at least, whether there are not more than seven Sacraments, divides the seven into groups with very important notes of difference, and decides that the Eucharist is '*Sacramentorum omnium potissimum.*' . . . The Council of Trent has an anathema for any one who says that the seven Sacraments are so equal that none is more worthy than another; Richard Baxter distinguishes between 'three sorts of Sacraments.' . . . For special vocations there are special means of grace."—Dr. Paget, Bishop of Oxford, in "Lux Mundi," p. 355, 356, Fifth Edition.

of the things which for centuries have stood out with a prominence that predicates their permanence. As Dr. Briggs said in 1909, "History speaks very strongly for the Historical Episcopate. My historic sense . . . leads me to the opinion that the Church, guided by the Divine Spirit, did not err in its Episcopal government through all these centuries."[46] An institution which is practically coterminous with the history of the Christian Church, which obtains in probably two-thirds of Christendom to-day, which is associated with that part of Christendom which is least susceptible to sect-disintegration—is it likely that such an institution is to be entirely eliminated from the united Church of the future? Is there to be no corporate continuity between the Church of the future and the Church of the past, between the Church of the age and the Church of the ages?

V. The Papacy is permanent. One can respectfully distinguish between the Papacy and papalism. Papalism in the ecclesiastical sphere may

---

[46] "If a ministry came into existence, it was because some work vital to the life of the Church had to be performed. If that ministry became permanent, it was because the needs which called it into existence proved to be permanent. If the same type of ministry and the same titles prevailed in all the local Churches, it was because the same needs were felt by all local groups of Christians."—Hamilton's "People of God," Vol. II, p. 170.

"The president, sometimes called the pastor, but usually the bishop, became gradually the centre of all the ecclesiastical life of the local Christian Church and the one potent office bearer. . . . The change came gradually. It provoked no great opposition. It was everywhere, or almost everywhere, accepted."—"The Church and the Ministry," Lindsay, p. 205.

be in the same category with Kaiserism in the political sphere. The onward march of events may remove both from the world. But this does not mean the overthrow of government and headship in Church and State. Democracy does not mean anarchy or unbridled individualism. S. Paul was the spokesman of the Christian democracy: "By one Spirit are we all baptized into one body, whether we be Jews or Gentiles, whether we be bond or free." But this same S. Paul was a stickler for order and organization: "God hath set some in the Church, first apostles, secondarily prophets, thirdly teachers." A constitutional head of the Church[47] would not be out of harmony with the coming democracy, nor with vital Christianity. "The primacy of Rome was recognized" in the first place "because she was the champion of Christianity in holy love." She may become so again. What would happen if the whole Protestant world accepted the Pope's invitation to "come home"? The atmosphere would be changed, the fabric would undergo repairs, and some things that are obnoxious would become obsolete. A constitutionalized papacy makes no violent break

[47] See Briggs' "Church Unity," 421-425. Also Gore's "Orders and Unity," p. 195, as follows: "The Roman Communion is a great and wonderful part of the Christian Church, with a wonderful power of recovery and expansion, and, in moral and administrative matters, a wonderful power of self-reform. It is astonishing, if you read Calvin's denunciations of the Roman Church in his *Institutes*, to reckon how many of the abuses which he denounces have been completely remedied. But it is equally evident, at least to the present writer, that the Roman development of Christianity is a one-sided development."

with the past, contains no prejudices against the future, is not inimical to democracy, and it is not practicable to eliminate it from a world-wide Christian fellowship. What Protestant Christian is there, who does not desire corporate communion with such stalwart Christians as Cardinal Mercier and Father Velimirovic, who found their lives by losing them in shepherding their bleeding flocks?

These are some of the outstanding features of organized Christianity. They stand apart. The papacy, episcopacy, the presbytery—they stand apart. The priest and prophet stand apart. Is this aloofness and antagonism to be permanent?[48] Arguments cannot heal the breach. Faith and courage can; and these are within reach. The way of comprehension is the way of faith and courage. Unity by comprehension gives each body the unique opportunity for conquest from within. Heretofore the attacks have been made from without. Each has hurled against the other its heaviest guns and its fiercest missiles. The result is a drawn battle and a no-man's-land of utter desolation. The time has come for each to admit this, and,

[48] "The Reunion of the Protestant churches would be the completion of but one column only of the triumphal arch of the one true Church. The other column stands apart—the Roman Church; its base, as it claims, the rock on which the Church is founded, built of the memorial stones of the ages, unshaken in its massive proportions. Shall the two columns remain forever apart? Rather has it not already come to the point where on either side may be discerned the beginning of the curve which, when carried up to completion, shall make the one perfect arch?" Newman Smyth's "Passing Protestantism and Coming Catholicism," p. 175.

without surrender, to seek the privilege of demonstrating as a partner what he failed to do as a rival. Has each Church sufficient confidence in its own position to believe that it would find a place in the sun, if brought into interior contact with its undefeated foe? It may be said that the body of the larger claims would thus absorb the body of the smaller claims. On the contrary, would not the process be a kind of mutual assimilation rather than a one-sided absorption? In the composition of water, oxygen does not absorb hydrogen. They blend, and the lesser ingredient is as essential as the greater. That Church which undertakes to absorb another Church must expect great interior consequences. Let us suppose, by way of illustration, that the Anglican Communion went bodily into the Roman Communion, retaining certain easily granted rights and privileges.[49] Which would take the greater risk? The Roman. For why? The Anglican Communion would not have to abandon any dogmatic principle, though, for the time being, it would have to acquiesce in some novelties towards which it had taken a negative position. It would gain a strategic position in

[49] At any rate this was the attitude of Pope Leo XIII towards the Eastern Churches. "Nor is there any reason for you to fear on that account that We or any of Our successors will ever diminish your rights, the privileges of your patriarchs, or the established ritual of any one of your churches. It has been and always will be the intent and tradition of the Apostolic See, to make a large allowance, in all that is right and good, for the primitive traditions and special customs of every nation."—Encyclical on the Reunion of Christendom, June 20, 1894.

being able to operate from the inside. The Roman Communion, on the other hand, would take great risk in receiving into the fold a powerful influence which might compel it to reconsider certain definitions which it presumed to make while in a state of isolation from the rest of Christendom. Or, let us suppose again, and again by way of illustration, that the Presbyterian Church, retaining certain readily granted rights, were to come bodily into the Anglican Church. Which would take the greater risk? The Anglican. For why? The Presbyterians would not have to give up their positives, though they might have to acquiesce temporarily in some things towards which they have taken a negative position. They would capture a strategic position for converting Anglicanism from within instead of attacking it from without. The Anglican Communion would run the risk of being overwhelmed by such a stalwart spiritual force. Paradoxical as it may seem, the absorbing body (if unity necessitated absorption) takes the greater risk. Herein is the strength of the Protestant position. It added no new dogmas[50] and therefore it would have to surrender none. It would lose nothing and gain the pearl of great price—the lost principle of unity.

But why talk of risks, when the great Head of the Church said that he that would lose his life

---

[50] "No Symbol has been adopted by any Protestant Church which adds anything whatever to the historic Faith of the Church." Briggs' "Theological Symbolics," p. 248.

shall find it; and that the gates of hell could not prevail against the Church? Why talk of risks, when "the unity of the Church is in holy love which binds Christians to Church and to one another"? Why talk of risks, when the only risk is that of making the grand discovery that things which men thought were contradictory are really complementary?

One does not like to quote Nietzsche much in these days, but he says some things that stir our sluggish souls. "Live dangerously," he says. Live courageously. Courage is the keen desire for life which takes the form of a challenge to death. God give the churches the faith and the courage to stake everything on Him!

The substance of it all is this: The world is groaning in pain. Vital principles are coming to the birth. A new age is dawning. That new age is to be indelibly stamped with internationalism, with a new social order and a wider ideal of brotherhood. These things are the outgrowth of Christianity. They must not be cut off from the Church. They must be housed within it. Can our chaotic Christianity preach and practise the gospel of brotherhood in Jesus Christ to a world that is beginning to dream of a universal Kingdom of God? Shall the churches lag behind the times? Will they learn to think and speak and act in terms of the whole? Will they abandon their self-consciousness and enter upon a self-forgetful adventure for the visible unity of the

people of God? Will they discern the signs of the times?

Nation is rising against nation, and Kingdom against Kingdom. There are famines and pestilences and fearful sights and great signs. Upon the earth there is distress of nations with perplexity. The sea and the waves are roaring. Men's hearts are failing them for fear and for looking after those things which are coming on the earth. The powers of heaven are being shaken. Let us read the signs of the times. Let us look through the war clouds that darken a distraught world and see the Son of Man coming anew into the lives of men with power and great glory.